

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 FIKRI BAYRAMOGLU,

11 Petitioner,

No. CIV S-11-0699 DAD P

12 vs.

13 J. TIM OCHOA,

14 Respondent.

ORDER

15 \_\_\_\_\_/  
16 Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed an application for a writ of  
17 habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, together with a request to proceed in forma  
18 pauperis. This court will not rule on petitioner's request to proceed in forma pauperis.

19 Petitioner is incarcerated in Riverside County and his underlying judgment of  
20 convicted was entered in the Marin County Superior Court. Marin County is in an area embraced  
21 by the United States District Court for the Northern District of California.

22 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d), courts in both the district of conviction and the  
23 district of confinement have concurrent jurisdiction over applications for habeas corpus filed by  
24 state prisoners. Because petitioner was not convicted in this district, and is not presently  
25 confined here, this court does not have jurisdiction to entertain the application.

26 /////

1 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

2 1. This court has not ruled on petitioner's request to proceed in forma pauperis;

3 2. This matter is transferred to the United States District Court for the Northern  
4 District of California. 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d); 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a).

5 DATED: March 23, 2011.

6  
7   
8 DALE A. DROZD  
9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10 DAD:kly  
11 bayr0699.108b  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26